

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for reviewing and considering the present application. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for considering the material cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of September 2, 2004. The *Office Action* dated April 19, 2007 has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-5 are hereby amended. Claims 1-5 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The *Office Action* includes an objection to the specification. In particular, the Examiner asserts that transmitting in a file format to the data array area, as recited in claim 5, is not mentioned in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with original claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

In addition, the *Office Action* includes an objection to claim 5. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the recitation of “the data array area” should be “a data array area,” in claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 5 to enhance the clarity of the claim language and overcome the objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 5.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0056225 (hereinafter *Bione*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,491, issued to *Tsao*. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, “generating a file by the input control data such that a format of the generated file depends on a manufacturer of an appliance.”

Applicants submit that *Bione* does not disclose these features. Rather, *Bione* discloses a modular multi-media converged service model. See *Bione* at Abstract. However, *Bione* does not describe or illustrate “generating a file by the input control data such that a format of the generated file depends on a manufacturer of an appliance,” as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, the Office even admits that *Bione* does not disclose generating “a file.” See *Office Action* at page 3.

In addition, *Tsao* does not cure the deficiencies of *Bione*. In contrast, *Tsao* discloses an upward and downward compatible data processing system. See *Tsao* at Abstract. As such, *Tsao* fails to disclose or suggest a method for controlling a home network system comprising, *inter alia*, “generating a file by the input control data such that a format of the generated file depends on a manufacturer of an appliance,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicants’ representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

Application No.: 10/506,432
Response dated July 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated April 19, 2007

Docket No.: 7950.029.00

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Blazek (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant



FIG.1

